UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/757,775	01/14/2004	Rodney J. Y. Ho	2606-3342-4557PT	5476

34395 7590 01/25/2008

OLYMPIC PATENT WORKS PLLC
P.O. BOX 4277
SEATTLE, WA 98104

EXAMINER	
RAMACHANDRAN, UMAMAHESWARI	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
1617	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
01/25/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/757,775	HO ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Umamaheswari Ramachandran	1617	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *06 November 2007*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-9 and 15-17* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-9, 15-17* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Applicants' election of group I, claims 1-17 and election of species in the reply filed on 11/6/2007 is acknowledged. Claims 18-45 have been cancelled. Applicants' further elect a single anti-HIV drug and lipid as species and elect indinavair as the anti-HIV species and phophatidyl choline as the lipid species. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)). Thus the restriction requirement elected is made final. Claims 1-9 and 15-17 read on the elected species. Claims 10-14 are withdrawn from consideration. Claims 1-9 and 15-17 are pending and are being examined on the merits herein.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1-5, 7-9, 15-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gagne et al. (Biochimica et Biophysica Accta 1558, 2002, 198-210) in view of Kirpotin (U.S. 6,110,491).

Gagne et al. teach sterically stabilized immunoliposome complexes comprising anti-HIV drug indinavair, dipalmitoylphosphatidylcholine (DPPC) and dipalmitoylphosphatidylglycerol (DPPG) (p 200, 2.5 Preparation of immunoliposomes containing indinavair). The reference teach that liposome based therapy represents a logical approach to improve the delivery of anti-HIV agents into lymphoid tissues to prevent establishment of an HIV reservoir as well as viral replication during the chemical latency period (p 199, para 2, lines 1-5). The reference further teach the subcutaneous delivery of the liposome complex comprising the drug indinavair to mice (34.3 indinavair/kg; 540 lipids/kg, i.e. lipid to drug ratio is 15.7:1) (p 201, 2.8. In vivo toxicity). The reference teaches the vesicle size to be 100-120 nm.

The reference does not teach the lipid to be phosphatidylcholine.

Kirpotin teach exemplary vesicle-forming lipids include the phospholipids, such as phosphatidylcholine, phosphatidylethanolamine, phosphatidic acid, phosphatidylinositol and other suitable lipids include glycolipids, and sterols such as cholesterol (col. 9, 25-28). The reference further teach suitable compounds in the liposome complex preparation include low water solubility compounds preferably in the pH range of 3-9 such as HIV protease inhibitors including indinavair, ritonavair etc. (col. 7, lines 54-56, col. 8, lines 32-33). The reference also teach liposomes composed of the

lipids egg phosphatidycholine (PC), cholesterol (CHOL) and teach lipid to drug ratio of 1μm to 200 nm (example 1) which is 5:1.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to formulate a lipid drug complex comprising phosphatidylcholine because of the teachings of Kirpotin. The reference teaches phosphatidylcholine as one of the exemplary lipid and teaches a formulation comprising the lipid and a drug. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to formulate a lipid-drug complex using phosphatidylcholine because of expectation of success as Kirpotin teaches lipid drug complexes with the lipids including phosphatidylcholine. Also, Gagne teaches lipid drug complexes comprising indinavair and substituting one lipid for another would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. The references do not explicitly teach that the drug substantially dissociates from the lipid-drug complex within a pH range of 5.0-8.0. The herein-claimed dissociation properties do not lend patentability to the claims because they are inherent properties of the formulation that would be produced following the suggestions of the prior art. Gagne and Kirpotin in combination teach the components of the lipid-drug complex, the drug indinavair in a liposome and hence it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the drug substantially dissociates form the drug complex within a pH range from about 5- 8.

Claims 6 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gagne et al. (Biochimica et Biophysica Accta 1558, 2002, 198-210) in view of Kirpotin (U.S. 6,110,491) as applied to claims 1-9, 15, 16 above and further in view of

1-5, 7-9, 15-16

Thibodeau (Molecular Engineering, 1991, 275-293) and Konigsberg et al. (U.S. 5,258,499).

Gagne et al. and Kirpotin's teachings discussed as above.

Gagne and Kirpotin do not teach the liposome to be unilamellar or lipid-drug complex to be 50-80 nm in diameter.

Thibodeau teach the role of liposomes in antigen delivery, preparation of liposomes and further teach that the most commonly used lipids are phospholipids, major structural components of biological membranes and the most common phospholipid is phosphatidyl choline (PC) (p 276, para 4). The reference also teach that the liposomes may differ with respect to dimension (from 25 nm to several microns in diameter) and structure (monolamellar or multilamellar). The reference also teaches the preparation of unilamellar liposome (p 281, preparation of immunosomes).

Konigsberg et al. teach delivery vehicle formulations comprising active agents encapsulated within liposomal vehicles (see Abstract). The reference teach that unilamellar liposomal liposomes have been shown to be useful in targeting solid tumors and to have greater circulation times than other vehicles (col. 15, lines 29-32).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to make a lipid drug complex where the liposome is unilamellar because of the teachings of Thibodeau and Konigsberg et al. Thibodeau teach the preparation of unilamellar liposomes in antigen delivery and Konigsberg et al. teach that unilamellar liposomal liposomes have been shown to be useful in targeting solid tumors and to have greater circulation times than other vehicles. One of ordinary skill in the art would have

been motivated in expectation of success in preparation of unilamellar liposomes from Thibodeau's teachings and to target solid tumors and for greater circulation times than other vehicles by formulating unilamellar liposomes as stated by Konigsberg.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to formulate a lipid-drug complex of 50-80 nm in diameter because of the teachings of Gagne and Thibodeau et al. Gagne teach vesicles in the size range of 100-120 nm and Thibodeau teach the liposomes can be in the range of 25 nm to several microns in diameter. Also, the size is a result effective parameter that a person of ordinary skill in the art would routinely optimize. Optimization of parameters is a routine practice that would be obvious for a person of ordinary skill in the art to employ. It would have been customary for an artisan of ordinary skill to determine the optimal size of the vesicles in order to best achieve the desired results. Thus, absent some demonstration of unexpected results from the claimed parameters, this optimization of ingredient amount would have been obvious at the time of applicant's invention.

Conclusion

No claims are allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Umamaheswari Ramachandran whose telephone number is 571-272-9926. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sreeni Padmanabhan can be reached on 571-272-0629. The fax phone

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

***